

REMARKS

Applicant has reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on March 15, 2002, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 35-73 are added, as a result, claims 19-73 are now pending in this application.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 19-22, 25-30, 33, and 34 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ma et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,060,896).

Independent claim 19 recites a method for measuring a voltage at an internal node of an integrated circuit. The method recites coupling a pass circuit between the internal node and a pin of the integrated circuit. The method further recites driving the pass circuit "to pass the voltage from the internal node to the pin". The Ma et al. patent does not disclose the element "to pass the voltage from the internal node to the pin". The Ma et al. patent discloses a memory chip having a sensing circuit for receiving a supper voltage at an input node during a test mode. Based on the super voltage, an output circuit generates two possible logic states. One of the two possible logic states indicates that the memory chip is in the super voltage test mode. The other logic state indicates that the memory chip is in the normal operational mode. Thus, the Ma et al. patent discloses a memory chip having a circuit that indicates whether the memory the is in a supper voltage test mode or in a normal operational mode. Therefore, the Ma et al. patent discloses a different method than the method of claim 19. See column 3, lines 9-25, and also the abstract.

In light of the differences presented about regarding claim 19, Applicant believes that claim 19 is patentable over the Ma et al. patent. Therefore, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19 and that claim 19 be allowed.

Dependent claims 20-22 and 25-27 depend on independent claim 19. In light of the reasons presented above regarding claim 19, Applicant believes that claims 20-22 and 25-27 are not anticipated by the Ma et al. patent for the reasons presented above, plus the elements in the dependent claims. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 20-22 and 25-27 and that these claims be allowed.

Independent claim 28 also recites similar elements as the elements of claim 19 which distinguishes from the Ma et al. patent for similar reasons. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 28 and that claim 28 be allowed.

Dependent claims 29-30 and 33-34 depend on independent claim 28. In light of the reasons presented above regarding claim 28, Applicant believes that claims 29-30 and 33-34 are not anticipated by the Ma et al. patent for the reasons presented above, plus the elements in the dependent claims. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 29-30 and 33-34 and that these claims be allowed.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 23, 24, 31, and 32 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ma et al. in view of Mitsui (U.S. Patent No. 5,999,009).

Dependent claims 23 and 24 depend on independent claim 19. As presented above in the 102 section, the Ma et al. patent does not disclose the element recited in independent claim 19. The Mitsui patent also does not disclose the elements recited in independent claim 19. Since neither the Ma et al. patent nor the Mitsui patent discloses the elements of claim 19, Applicant believes that claim 19 is patentable over the Ma et al. patent in view of the Mitsui patent. Since claims 23 and 24 depend on the claim 19, Applicant believes that claims 23 and 24 are also patentable over the Ma et al. patent in view of the Mitsui patent. Therefore, Applicants requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 23 and 24 and that these claims be allowed.

Dependent claims 31 and 32 depend on independent claim 28. Since claim 28 recites similar elements as that of claim 19, Applicant believes that claim 28 is patentable over Ma et al. in view of the Mitsui patent. Since claims 31 and 32 depend on the claim 28, Applicant believes that claims 31 and 32 are also patentable over the Ma et al. patent in view of the Mitsui patent. Therefore, Applicants requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 31 and 32 and that these claims be allowed.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's representative at (612) 373-6969 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,


DANIEL R. LOUGHMILLER ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6969

Date 6.17.02

By


Viet V. Tong
Reg. No. 45,416

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on this 17 day of June, 2002.

Name

Tina Kohout ✓

Signature

T Kohout